

Serial No.: 09/690,367  
Response to Office Action

Docket No. 1005.9  
Customer No. 53953

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks. Claims 8-12, 20-24 and 32-48 are pending.

The Office Action rejected claims 11, 23 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,763,496 ("Hennings"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,922 ("Schilit").

Claim 11 recites:

11. A method performed by a computer system, comprising:
  - storing a first version of a paper, the first version including first content at a first location within the paper;
  - translating the first version into a second version of the paper, the second version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper, the second version including the first content at the first location within the paper;
  - in response to the first content at the first location within the paper, detecting a reference within the first content at the first location within the paper, the detected reference being associated with a second location and being at least one of the following, other than a computer network address: an alphanumeric character; a symbol; a term; and a phrase; and
  - in response to the detected reference, forming a link within the second version between the first location and the second location, the link being embedded within at least a portion of the first content at the first location within the paper, and the portion of the first content at the first location within the paper being: displayable on the display device as part of at least the second version, which is displayable on the display device as the likeness of the paper; and user-selectable through the link to cause an operation associated with the second location.

Serial No.: 09/690,367  
Response to Office Action

Docket No. 1005.9  
Customer No. 53953

Claim 23 recites:

23. A system, comprising:  
a computing device for:  
storing a first version of a paper, the first version including first  
content at a first location within the paper;  
translating the first version into a second version of the paper, the  
second version being displayable on a display device as a  
likeness of the paper, the second version including the first  
content at the first location within the paper;  
in response to the first content at the first location within the paper,  
detecting a reference within the first content at the first location  
within the paper, the detected reference being associated with a  
second location and being at least one of the following, other  
than a computer network address: an alphanumeric character;  
a symbol; a term; and a phrase; and  
in response to the detected reference, forming a link within the second  
version between the first location and the second location, the  
link being embedded within at least a portion of the first  
content at the first location within the paper, and the portion of  
the first content at the first location within the paper being:  
displayable on the display device as part of at least the second  
version, which is displayable on the display device as the  
likeness of the paper; and user-selectable through the link to  
cause an operation associated with the second location.

Serial No.: 09/690,367  
Response to Office Action

Docket No. 1005.9  
Customer No. 53953

Claim 35 recites:

35. A computer program product, comprising:  
a computer program processable by a computer system for causing the  
computer system to:  
store a first version of a paper, the first version including first content  
at a first location within the paper;  
translate the first version into a second version of the paper, the second  
version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of  
the paper, the second version including the first content at the  
first location within the paper;  
in response to the first content at the first location within the paper,  
detect a reference within the first content at the first location  
within the paper, the detected reference being associated with a  
second location and being at least one of the following, other  
than a computer network address: an alphanumeric character;  
a symbol; a term; and a phrase; and  
in response to the detected reference, form a link within the second  
version between the first location and the second location, the  
link being embedded within at least a portion of the first  
content at the first location within the paper, and the portion of  
the first content at the first location within the paper being:  
displayable on the display device as part of at least the second  
version, which is displayable on the display device as the  
likeness of the paper; and user-selectable through the link to  
cause an operation associated with the second location; and  
an apparatus from which the computer program is accessible by the computer  
system.

As stated in MPEP § 2142, "...The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any prima facie conclusion of obviousness. If the examiner does not produce a prima facie case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness..." Also, MPEP § 2142 states: "...the examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical 'person of ordinary skill in the art' when the invention was unknown and just before it was made...The examiner must put aside knowledge of the applicant's disclosure, refrain from using hindsight, and consider the subject matter claimed 'as a whole.'" Further, MPEP § 2143.01 states: "The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination."

Serial No.: 09/690,367  
Response to Office Action

Docket No. 1005.9  
Customer No. 53953

In relation to claim 11, Hennings and Schilit are defective in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. For example, as between Hennings, Schilit and Applicant's specification, only Applicant's specification teaches the combination of elements in claim 11. In fact, Hennings and Schilit teach away from such a combination.

In claim 11, the first version of the paper includes "*the first content at the first location within the paper.*" Also, the second version of the paper includes "*the first content at the first location within the paper.*" Further, a reference is detected within "*the first content at the first location within the paper.*" Moreover, in response to the detected reference, a link is formed within the second version between the first location and a second location, the link being embedded within at least a portion of "*the first content at the first location within the paper.*" Such portion of "*the first content at the first location within the paper*" is displayable on the display device as part of at least the second version, which is displayable on the display device as the likeness of the paper.

Unlike claim 11, Hennings teaches away from such a combination. In Hennings, a first version of a page (i.e., design page 550 of Fig. 9A) is translated into a second version of a page (i.e., display page 584 of Fig. 9B). As shown in Fig. 9B, the created hyperlinks 588 are embedded within respective "Elephant," "Rhino" and "Hippo" content of the display page 584, which are different from one another, and likewise are different from the "Large Animals" content of the display page 584. Likewise, the created hyperlinks 590 are embedded within respective "Lion," "Tiger" and "Leopard" content of the display page 584, which are different from one another, and likewise are different from the "Big Cats" content of the display page 584.

Although the created hyperlinks 588 are embedded within respective "Elephant," "Rhino" and "Hippo" content of the display page 584, the first version of the page (i.e., design page 550 of Fig. 9A) fails to include such content. Likewise, although the created hyperlinks 590 are embedded within respective "Lion," "Tiger" and "Leopard" content of the display page 584, the first version of the page (i.e., design page 550 of Fig. 9A) fails to include such content. Thus, such content fails to satisfy "*the first content at the first location within the paper*" limitation in claim 11, because claim 11 recites that the first version of the paper includes "*the first content at the first location within the paper.*"

Serial No.: 09/690,367  
Response to Office Action

Docket No. 1005.9  
Customer No. 53953

Moreover, although the first version of the page (i.e., design page 550 of Fig. 9A) includes “category\_bot= large” and “category\_bot= cats” content, the second version of the page (i.e., display page 584 of Fig. 9B) fails to include such content. Instead, the second version of the page (i.e., display page 584 of Fig. 9B): (a) replaces the “category\_bot= large” content with the “Elephant,” “Rhino” and “Hippo” content; and (b) likewise, replaces the “category\_bot= cats” content with the “Lion,” “Tiger” and “Leopard” content. Thus, the “category\_bot= large” and “category\_bot= cats” content fail to satisfy *“the first content at the first location within the paper”* limitation in claim 11, because claim 11 recites that the second version of the paper includes *“the first content at the first location within the paper.”*

Likewise, the “category\_bot= large” and “category\_bot= cats” content are not displayable on the display device as part of the second version of the page (i.e., display page 584 of Fig. 9B). Thus, the “category\_bot= large” and “category\_bot= cats” content fail to satisfy *“the first content at the first location within the paper”* limitation in claim 11, because claim 11 recites that the portion (in which the link is embedded) of *“the first content at the first location within the paper”* is displayable on the display device as part of at least the second version, which is displayable on the display device as the likeness of the paper.

Further, although both the first version of the page (i.e., design page 550 of Fig. 9A) and the second version of the page (i.e., display page 584 of Fig. 9B) include the “Large Animals” and “Big Cats” content, Hennings teaches away from embedding the created hyperlinks 588 and 590 within such content. Instead, the created hyperlinks 588 are embedded within respective “Elephant,” “Rhino” and “Hippo” content, and the created hyperlinks 590 are embedded within respective “Lion,” “Tiger” and “Leopard” content. Thus, the “Large Animals” and “Big Cats” content fail to satisfy *“the first content at the first location within the paper”* limitation in claim 11, because claim 11 recites that a link is embedded within at least a portion of *“the first content at the first location within the paper.”*

Clearly, therefore, Hennings fails to teach claim 11, and in fact teaches away from it.

Likewise, Schilit fails to teach claim 11, and in fact teaches away from it. The Office Action states that Schilit “detects a reference...through the detection of annotations.” However, contrary to claim 11, Schilit teaches (at col. 6, lines 1-4), “If the link corresponds to a target portion that is related to the context of a particular annotation then the *link is*

Serial No.: 09/690,367  
Response to Office Action

Docket No. 1005.9  
Customer No. 53953

*displayed in a margin adjacent to the annotation as a margin representation 34 as shown in FIG. 2*" (emphasis added). As shown in Fig. 2, the margin representation 34 is *not* embedded within the annotation. Instead, the margin representation 34 is merely displayed in the *margin*, where *no* content was previously displayed. By comparison, in claim 11: (a) the reference is detected *within the first content at the first location* within the paper; and (b) the link is embedded *within at least a portion of the first content at the first location*.

Clearly, therefore, Hennings and Schilit fail to teach claim 11, and in fact teach away from it. Thus, the motivation for advantageously combining the claimed elements would arise solely from hindsight based on Applicant's teachings in its own specification. Accordingly, the PTO's burden of factually supporting a prima facie case of obviousness has not been met.

In relation to claims 23 and 35, Hennings and Schilit are likewise defective in establishing a prima facie case of obviousness.

Thus, a rejection of claims 11, 23 and 35 is not supported.

### Conclusion

For these reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 11, 23 and 35.

Dependent claims 8-10, 12 and 37-40 depend from and further limit claim 11 and therefore are allowable.

Dependent claims 20-22, 24 and 41-44 depend from and further limit claim 23 and therefore are allowable.

Dependent claims 32-34, 36 and 45-48 depend from and further limit claim 35 and therefore are allowable.

An early formal notice of allowance of claims 8-12, 20-24 and 32-48 is requested.

To the extent that this Response to Office Action results in additional fees, the Commissioner is authorized to charge deposit account no. 50-3524.

Serial No.: 09/690,367  
Response to Office Action

Docket No. 1005.9  
Customer No. 53953

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. If any unresolved aspect remains, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Davis, Jr.  
Registration No. 35,488

Date: August 7, 2006  
Davis Law Group, P.C.  
9020 N. Capital of Texas Hwy.  
Bldg. 1, Suite 375  
Austin, Texas 78759  
Telephone 512-306-8324  
Facsimile 512-306-8374  
Docket Number: 1005.9

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below:	
Fax Number: 571-273-8300	
Michael A. Davis, Jr.	
TYPE OR PRINT NAME	
	
SIGNATURE	
August 7, 2006	
DATE OF TRANSMISSION	